

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
KARIM PANJWANI,

Plaintiff,

-against-

JET WAY SECURITY & INVESTIGATIONS, LLC

Defendant.  
-----X

FILED  
IN CLERK'S OFFICE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.

★ JUL 07 2016 ★

BROOKLYN OFFICE

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

13-cv-7186 (SLT) (VMS)

**TOWNES, United States District Judge:**

Plaintiff Karim Panjwani filed this *pro se* action on July 16, 2013, in the Southern District of New York. (ECF No. 2.) He sued Defendant Jet Way Security & Investigations, LLC for alleged violations of federal and state civil rights laws under 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.*, 29 U.S.C. § 621 *et seq.*, and N.Y. Exec. Law § 296. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant refused to hire him as a security guard on the basis of his national origin, race/color, marital status, and age. The Southern District of New York subsequently transferred the case to this jurisdiction. (ECF No. 13.)

Before the Court is Defendant's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 39-43), which this Court referred to Magistrate Judge Vera M. Scanlon ("Judge Scanlon") for a report and recommendation. (ECF No. 45.) On February 26, 2016, Judge Scanlon electronically filed and served her Report and Recommendation ("R&R") in which she recommended granting Defendant's motion in its entirety and dismissing all claims against the Defendant. (ECF No. 51.) The R&R was mailed to *pro se* Plaintiff. (*Id.*) The R&R also set forth that any objections to the R&R were to be filed within fourteen days of service. (*Id.* at 26.) To date, no objections have been filed and no party has requested an extension of time in which to do so.

A district court is not required to review the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of a report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Even when no objections are filed, however,

many courts seek to satisfy themselves “that there is no clear error on the face of the record.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee note (1983 Addition); *see also Edwards v. Town of Huntington*, No. 05 Civ. 339 (NGG) (AKT), 2007 WL 2027913, at \*2 (E.D.N.Y. July 11, 2007).

Although not required to do so, this Court has reviewed Judge Scanlon’s R&R for clear error on the face of the record. The Court finds no clear error, and therefore adopts the R&R in its entirety as the opinion of the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons stated above, Judge Scanlon’s R&R dated February 26, 2016, recommending that Defendant’s motion be granted in its entirety and that Plaintiff’s action be dismissed in its entirety, is adopted in its entirety. Plaintiff’s action is hereby dismissed and judgment is entered in favor of Defendant. The Clerk of the Court is directed to mail a copy of this Memorandum and Order to *pro se* Plaintiff. The Clerk of the Court is further directed to close this case.

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Sandra L. Townes  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SANDRA L. TOWNES  
United States District Judge

Dated: July 6, 2016  
Brooklyn, New York